

MINUTES
Workshop on national road safety strategies and road safety planning
Brussels, 25 November 2013

Attendees Present:	António Avenoso (ETSC), Victor Brangeon (FIA), Marie Brasseur (EuroNCAP), Johann Philipp Bratfisch (Nissan Motor), Desmond Collins (Continental), Aline Delhaye (FEMA), José Luis Díez (ERF), Kallistratos Dionelis (ASECAP), Nils Johan Garnes (EuroCare), Graziella Jost (ETSC), Wim Labro (CITA), Marte Lillehagen Garnes (Norwegian Ministry of Transport), Kirsi Marita Löytty (Finnish Transport Safety Agency), Laura Marot (FEMA), Jeannot Mersch (FEVR), Josef Mikulík (Czech Transport Research Centre – CDV), Jesús Monclús (Fundacion MAPFRE), Jan Nemeč (IRU), Ellen Opdenakker (Belgian Road Safety Institute), Malika Seddi (ASECAP), Ellen Townsend (ETSC), Veneta Vassileva (ACEM), Koenraad Verduyn (PTV Group), Fay Watson (EURAD), Ceri Woolsgrove (ECF)
From DG MOVE:	Szabolcs Schmidt, Susanne Lindahl, Sandra Amaro,

1. Introduction

Mr Schmidt, Head of the Road Safety unit of DG MOVE, welcomed the participants and introduced the objectives of the workshop: to discuss in an open and informal way some good road safety planning practices with NGOs and organisations in order to hear their views and to complement the inputs from EU Member States via the High Level Group on Road Safety (HLG).

Ms Lindahl presented the background to the initiative: a follow-up to the road safety policy orientations 2011-2020, with the objective to facilitate and inspire more exchange of ideas, good practice examples and lessons learned between Member States on road safety planning. The HLG has already discussed the initiative twice in 2013 and will receive a draft paper before their next meeting in early 2014. This paper will take into account comments received in the workshop on 25 November.

The workshop consisted of two sections: first a discussion on road safety planning elements and road safety planning tools and secondly a discussion on concrete good practice examples from national road safety action plans.

2. First discussion: road safety planning

The participants generally expressed agreement with the basic assumptions by the European Commission: the usefulness of a fact-based approach, of target-setting and the use of performance indicators for follow-up, the importance of assigning responsibility and a budget to actions and the approach of using lessons learnt in order to inform and improve the next planning cycle. Data availability and proper problem analysis / evaluation of efficiency of proposed measures were especially stressed. Mr Avenoso from ETSC made a short presentation of the conclusions drawn by ETSC, supporting the same assumptions. He concluded that, although every Member State already has many elements of good road safety policy in place, there is still scope for improved road safety planning procedures in most Member States.

Issues that were brought up in the session included:

- The usefulness of an inclusive approach to road safety planning, with consultation of a broad set of stakeholders, e.g. victim organisations and the industry.
- Some road user groups need special attention: e.g. powered two-wheeler riders, cyclists, pedestrians and especially vulnerable road user groups such as children and disabled. A way to make sure all road user groups are taken into account is by adopting specific performance indicators relating to their safety and to ensure they are part of the risk analysis.
- Mid-term evaluation of plans can help improving performance already during the strategy period.
- The benefits of common European benchmarks and common performance indicators for comparability.
- The need for access to good and accurate data and the problem of privacy laws obstructing road safety analysis; the usefulness of road safety observatories as a knowledge base.
- The importance of proper financing of road safety and the importance of political will to implement actions; political will can be shown by budgetising actions in the action plan properly.
- Road safety plans were proposed to be most important for the Member States starting to work in this area and might be of less importance for Member States already performing well.
- Participants underlined repeatedly that planning is important but that implementation is still the most important factor.

3. Second discussion: good practice examples

Workshop participants agreed to the good practice examples presented by the Commission and in addition discussed a number of other possible areas to be mentioned in a revised discussion paper.

Among the issues discussed were:

- The special challenges in the urban environment including safety of vulnerable road users, urban freight flows and urban infrastructure.
- The specific challenges for motorway safety, e.g. ghost drivers and drowsiness.
- The "pros and cons" of modern technologies: road safety benefits, (the ISA was especially mentioned) but increased costs for consumers and question of effective use of freight weight.
- The need to look at actions also addressing the seriously injured.
- Addressing citizens as consumers and not only as road users, e.g. spreading consumer information about safety ratings.
- The needs for safe cycling infrastructure and motorcycle infrastructure.
- Alcohol Interlock as a tool also for professional drivers and not only for repeat offenders.
- The usefulness of fraud-safe e-call in wider deployment.
- Work-related road safety.
- The good experience of applying mid-separation barriers in Norway.
- The good experience of promoting reflectors for visibility in the dark in Finland.
- A proposal to prohibit pedestrian crossings on all Ten-T roads.
- Training of road safety professionals

4. Conclusions and final words

Participants expressed appreciation for the invitation and for the informal and inclusive workshop. The Commission was encouraged to organise similar workshops also for other initiatives in the future.

Participants asked the Commission to publish, if possible, background information such as the national road safety plans on the website. An interest in receiving information about the outcome of the initiative was expressed.